



Loxwood Parish Council

Clerk: Jane Bromley

Tel: 01403 791323

email: clerk@loxwood-pc.gov.uk

LOXWOOD PARISH COUNCIL FLOOD FORUM Zoom Meeting 10:00am 19th October 2020

MINUTES:

Attendees: Kevin Macknay and Sue Furlong (WSCC); Tom Lamboo (EA); Bryan Bleeker (SW); Dom Henley (CDC Flood Engineer); Loxwood Parish Councillors: Rick Kelsey (Chair); Tony Colling; Roger Newman; and Chris Agar. Flood Consultant Nigel Simmonds. 7 Members of the public.

1. **Welcome and Introductions.** Attendees were welcomed and introduced.
2. **Apologies.** None.
3. **Water Environment Report on Loxwood Stream - General Summary.** A power point presentation as attached was displayed to the group by Nigel Simmonds.

4. **Water Environment Report on Loxwood Stream - Proposals and Funding.**

EA to give clarity as to what powers exist to ensure mitigation measures on private land can be carried out. EA to confirm. **ACTION EA** TL replied that Riparian Ownership laws were being investigated and the EA would come back to the PC. ST advised Operation Watershed is not about enforcement and would be a consideration when awarding funding. KM WSCC advised some issues were Riparian and should be taken forward by the EA the upsizing of constructions cannot be enforced under Riparian responsibilities.

Phase 1 - Burley Close/Station Road: Proposals as per presentation. It was anticipated an application to Operation Watershed could be made for this work. Those works on school land would need to be discussed with Southern Water as well as Operation Watershed. Clearing the Oak Grove culvert would be attributed to Riparian Duties.

Phase 2 - Burley Close/Oak Grove: Works on private property involve removing a wall and private land ownership consent would be required.

Phase 3 - Oak Grove to Guildford Road: Water Environment suggest flow measurements be undertaken in this area. This will involve further costs. Mix of private land ownership issues and WSCC Highways issues no obvious one authority.

Realistic time scale between 5 to 10 years and will only provide marginal relief not alleviation. It needs to be considered if some of the items are worthwhile given the cost. TL considered it was down to individual land owners to consider and the risk they perceive. Oak Grove only certain individuals are affected. EA Lawyers will look at this but work on private land cannot be forced. Engagement with land owners and home owners is key. Land owners whose

properties don't flood may not be prepared to undertake work for houses lower down the stream.

NS If there are difficulties getting some work done then there is question as to whether any of it should be done.

TL advised an EA for the whole of Loxwood probably would not be possible as the recommendation was for the Parish Council to look at small scale mitigation measures.

TC Mott Macdonald work that was investigated was to widen the stream which was not cost effective in terms of benefit. Extent of works now proposed a lot less extensive than widening the whole stream by 3m. Could the EA now take it on as a scheme without having to pay for it so the Parish Council could then get the necessary powers through proxy to enforce measures. TL to take back to EA.

SF advised the Parish Council should approach Operation Watershed and other funders first regarding funding as Operation Watershed for example, would not fund an EA run project.

Way forward:

1) EA to advise whether they would take on the project for the small-scale mitigation measures. **Action EA**

2) PC to discuss with operation Watershed as to what can be funded. **ACTION SF/Parish Council**

3) PC not able to do various elements necessary due to enforcement of Riparian Duties may not be possible. NS advised discussions to date implied there would be problems with Riparian Duties. SF advised further community engagement should occur to try to move forward in partnership with the Landowners and to assess which of those are on board. **ACTION Parish Council**

DH from CDC felt options should be prioritised for impact and that Operation Watershed might fund. How many houses will the new measures protect to analyse a simple cost benefit analysis. If it still does give enough benefit the CDC would work with individual owners for property level protection. TL from EA agreed with this. Look at what can be done. Individual property protection hasn't yet been looked at.

Resident in Pond Close stressed the importance of taking action as it had been 7 years since the flooding. Important to do what can be done. NS advised that all the stages were interlinked and affect one another. The affect would be marginal individually but together will make a difference.

CA could works carried upstream make it worse for those down- stream. TL agreed and would discuss with the EA but felt it would not be considered to be an EA scheme.

5. **Loxwood Stream Maintenance.** Loxwood PC have done what they can to coordinate activities and must now rely on each Riparian Owner to do work that it deemed necessary. A Group has been set up to coordinate this in the future. Resident asked regarding the school site can WSCC enforce keeping the drains clear via Riparian Duties or who would follow through these works. KM Riparian duties usually streams and ditches not drains. The school should be keeping their drains clear. KM to speak to WSCC Schools and raise the issue of the drains. **ACTION KM** SF advised Operation Watershed can help fund this and would need to talk to school surveyors. This is part of Phase one above although under Phase one it is looking at a severe rainfall event and not day to day drainage.

6. **Neighbourhood Plan Update - Drainage Issues.** TC talked through the policies in the Neighbourhood Plan. Proposal for more housing to the west of the B2133. Sites require SUDs. It is a concern that the increase in housing could affect waste and surface water situation. Waste and surface water policies goes into detail the history of flooding and foul water problems in Loxwood. It introduces a flooding database as an aim for the Parish Council to collate information on flooding events going forward to be used to perhaps convince SW or the EA that work needs to be done. Flood Risk assessments included in the policy for both developments and extensions to assess 1:100 events plus 40% climate change allowance. Reg 14 now ongoing until 9th November.
7. **Southern Water - Proposed DWMP and other issues.** NS stressed that Southern Water look at the Parish as a whole looking at the impact of all proposed sites in the NP. BB went through a power point presentation on how infrastructure investment was instigated. Potential upgrade in 5 to 10 years but Loxwood catchment has to be compared to others. SW has to accommodate development and temporary measures have to be installed ahead of major upgrades. Loxwood included for upgrade assessments in the next stage. New developments etc. will be looked at during the next stage. Thames Water are involved in the Loxwood situation as well. Works going on in Brewhurst Lane to be completed December 2021 it is a process quality improvement.
8. **Alfold Flood Forum – Feedback.** Pumping station at Alfold has a major impact on system downstream there is an intention that Thames Water will divert flow from Loxwood. SW need to take this into account in their impact assessment. Thames Water expect 5 to 10 years before action. BB advised SW were in consultation with Thames Water James Hearn. A hydraulic assessment report is expected after further modelling.
9. **Loxwood Flooding Database and new flooding issues.** A good idea of problems after a survey and the intention now is after a major event every person on database will receive a report form and we will be able to see if flooding problems are getting worse. Link to Loxwood weather station will be on flood section of the Loxwood website.
ACTION Clerk
10. **Any other business.** None.

The meeting closed at 12.25pm.